



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

H.A.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,647	03/10/2004	Michael W. Morrison	2269-6103US (03-0954.00/U)	4195
24247	7590	08/16/2006	EXAMINER LEWIS, MONICA	
TRASK BRITT P.O. BOX 2550 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84110			ART UNIT 2822	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 08/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/797,647	MORRISON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Monica Lewis	2822	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17-21 and 23-27 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed May 2, 2006.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 16 and 22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Additionally, Applicant argued that "the new subject matter in claim 16 is from claim 23, which was to a non-elected species, Applicants believe that the subject matter is similar enough to the subject matter of claim 22, that claims 22 and 23 should not be considered different species." However, the Applicant made an election without traverse on 10/24/05 that was acknowledged by the Examiner in the Office Action of 1/27/06. Hence, claims 17-21 and 23-27 were withdrawn from examination. It was previously indicated that claim 16 was generic. Therefore, upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities: a) it appears that "electric" should be "electrical." Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 16 and 22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is not clear what is meant by the following: a) "a longitudinal slot formed therethrough" (See Claim 16). It is not clear what the slot is formed through. That is, is the slot formed through the electrically conductive layer or the dielectric film. Claim 22 depends directly or indirectly from a rejected claim and are, therefore, also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph for the reasons set above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 16 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinsman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,268,650) in view of Dickey (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0008307).

In regards to claim 16, Kinsman et al. ("Kinsman") discloses the following:

a) a dielectric film (30) having at least one conductive trace (60-70) disposed upon a top surface thereof and at least one conductive via (92) formed therethrough (For Example: See Figure 2 and Figure 3); and

Art Unit: 2822

b) an electrically conductive layer (28) adhered to the dielectric film and operably coupled to the at least one conductive via, the electrically conductive layer comprising at least one electrical current isolation slot (50) formed therethrough, at least a part of the electric current isolation slot is coextensive with material of the dielectric film and a surface providing at least one electrical landing area (80) (For Example: See Figure 1).

In regards to claim 16, Kinsman fails to disclose the following:

a) a longitudinal slot formed therethrough.

However, Dickey discloses a semiconductor device that has a longitudinal slot (44) formed therethrough (For Example: See Figure 2). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the semiconductor of Kinsman to include a longitudinal slot formed therethrough as disclosed in Dickey because it aids in providing spacing and/or separation (For Example: See Figure 2 and Paragraph 31).

Additionally, since Kinsman and Dickey are both from the same field of endeavor, the purpose disclosed by Dickey would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Kinsman.

In regards to claim 22, Kinsman discloses the following:

a) the at least one electrical current isolation slot substantially segments the electrically conductive layer into at least two segments wherein high frequency noise present on a voltage source in a first segment of the at least two segments may be substantially isolated from the voltage source in another segment of the at least two segments (For Example: See Figure 1)(Note: Merriam-Webster defines "segment" as a portion cut off from a geometric figure by one or more points, lines or planes. The isolation slot (50) segments the conductive layer (28) into two segments (For Example: See Figure 1 and Figure 2). There is a segment of the conductive layer (28) on the left and another segment on the right (For Example: See Figure 2). Although Kinsman fails to specifically disclose "high frequency noise present on a voltage source in a first segment of the at least two segments may be substantially isolated from the voltage source in another segment of the at least two segments," the same structure is utilized in Kinsman as in Applicant's invention therefore it would have the same characteristics.).

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monica Lewis whose telephone number is 571-272-1838. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zandra Smith can be reached on 571-272-2429. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300 for regular and after final communications.

ML
August 7, 2006

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of stylized, overlapping loops and a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.